

## REMARKS

This Response is submitted in reply to the Office Action mailed July 28, 2004. Claims 1, 10, 12, 13, 14, 18 and 31 are amended herein. Claim 39 has been added. Claim 15 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. The Specification has been amended to correct minor grammatical errors. No new matter is being introduced by way of the amendments or additions.

A Terminal Disclaimer is submitted herewith. A check in the amount of \$198.00 is submitted herewith to cover the cost of the Terminal Disclaimer and new claim. Please charge Deposit Account No. 02-1818 for any insufficiency or credit.

The Examiner objected to Claim 12 because of a minor typographical error. Claim 12 is amended to correct the error and Applicants respectfully submit that the objection has been overcome.

In the Office Action, Claims 1-38 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1 to 51 of U.S. Patent No. 6,702,409 to Hedrick et al. ("*Hedrick*"). Applicants are hereby submitting a Terminal Disclaimer with this Response as indicated above to overcome these rejections. Accordingly, the double patenting rejections of Claims 1-38 should be withdrawn.

In the Office Action, Claims 1-5, 7-18 and 31-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,795,155 to Grande ("*Grande*"), and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,161,805 to Wells ("*Wells*"). Applicants respectfully disagree with this combination. However, to expedite prosecution, Claims 1, 10, 13 and 31 have been amended to clarify the movement of the bolster relative to the door and it is respectfully submitted that the amended claims are patentably distinguished over this combination.

*Grande* teaches a gaming device having a power down door open memory latch circuit which determines whether a door on the gaming device has been opened (i.e., tampered with) during a power failure. Upon the restoration of power after a power failure, the main processor of the gaming device determines the state of the latches and if the memory latch indicates that the door was unlocked and open during a power failure, the processor tilts the gaming device to prevent further operation. *Grande*

teaches a door connected to the gaming device, but as admitted in the Office Action, "*Grande* fails to teach a moveably connected bolster on the door." See, Office Action, page 4, lines 3-4.

*Wells* teaches a gaming device having a cabinet that includes opposing side wall panels. The bolster of *Wells* includes a pair of support arms respectively mounted to the side wall panels. A support bar is mounted between the support arms. The bolster of *Wells* is therefore attached to the side walls and not to the door.

The Office Action states that it would be obvious to mount the hand rest of *Wells* to a front door of a gaming device. See, Office Action, page 4, lines 9-13. However, the hand rest of *Wells* is not configured to be mounted to a rotating front door of a gaming device. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that one skilled in the art would not be inclined attach the hand rest of *Wells* to the rotating door of *Grande*. However, in order to expedite allowance of the claims, Applicants have amended independent Claims 1, 10, 13 and 31 to further clarify the movement of the bolster relative to the door. This clearly further distinguishes over the combination of *Wells* and *Grande*.

Amended Claim 1 is directed to a gaming device which includes a cabinet and a door moveably connected to the cabinet. A bolster is rotatably coupled to the door by a rotating mechanism mounted to the door, such that the bolster is rotatable along an axis substantially perpendicular to an outer panel of the door. The combination of *Grande* and *Wells* does not teach or suggest the elements of amended Claim 1. In particular, the combination of references does not teach a bolster that is rotatable along an axis substantially perpendicular to an outer panel of the door. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that amended Claim 1 and Claims 2-9 that depend therefrom are each structurally different, functionally different, patentable, and allowable over the combination of *Wells* and *Grande*.

Amended Claim 10 is directed to a gaming device which includes a cabinet and a door moveably connected to the cabinet. The gaming device includes a game operable on a wager by a player and also includes a door moveably connected to the cabinet, the door including an outer panel. A bolster is slidingly coupled to the door by a mechanism mounted to the door, and the bolster slides substantially parallel with respect to the outer panel. The combination of *Grande* and *Wells* does not teach or suggest the

elements of amended Claim 10. In particular, the combination of references does not teach a bolster that slides across and substantially parallel to the outer panel of the door. *Grande* merely teaches a bolster that pivots upwardly about an axis. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that amended Claim 10 and Claims 11-12 that depend therefrom are each structurally different, functionally different, patentable, and allowable over the combination of *Wells* and *Grande*.

Amended Claim 13 is directed to a gaming device which includes a cabinet and a door moveably connected to the cabinet. A bolster is pivotally coupled to the door, such that the bolster is pivotal along an axis substantially perpendicular to a front surface of the door. The combination of *Grande* and *Wells* does not teach or suggest the elements of amended Claim 13. In particular, the combination of references does not teach a bolster that is pivotal along an axis substantially perpendicular to a front surface of the door. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that amended Claim 13 and Claims 14-18 that depend therefrom are each structurally different, functionally different, patentable, and allowable over the combination of *Wells* and *Grande*.

Amended Claim 31 is directed to a method of manufacturing a gaming device which includes a cabinet, a door and a bolster. The method comprises pivotally connecting the door to the cabinet, and movably attaching the bolster to the door so that the bolster can be automatically moved from a closed position to a first open position upon the activation of a release mechanism, such that when the door is opened, the bolster is not obstructed by the adjacent gaming device. In particular, the relied upon art does not disclose or suggest a method of manufacturing a gaming device that includes movably attaching a bolster to the door, where the bolster automatically moves from one position to another upon activation of a release mechanism, as required by amended Claim 31. Rather *Wells* teaches that the bolster may be rotated upward when the player does not wish to use it. *Wells* does not compensate for the deficiencies of *Grande*. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 31 and Claims 32 to 35 that depend therefrom are each structurally different, functionally different, patentable, and allowable over the combination of *Wells* and *Grande*.


New Claim 39 is directed to a gaming device which includes a cabinet and a door moveably connected to the cabinet. A bolster is rotatably coupled to the door by a

rotating mechanism mounted to the door. The rotating mechanism includes a locking mechanism that is biased to move the bolster automatically upon release. The combination of *Grande* and *Wells* does not teach or suggest the elements of new Claim 39. In particular, the combination of references does not teach a bolster that has locking mechanism that is biased to move the bolster automatically upon release. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 39 is structurally different, functionally different, patentable, and allowable over the combination of *Wells* and *Grande*.

An earnest endeavor has been made to place this application in condition for formal allowance and in the absence of more pertinent art such action is courteously solicited. If the Examiner has any questions regarding this Amendment, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC



---

Adam H. Masia  
Reg. No. 35,602  
Bell, Boyd & Lloyd LLC  
P.O. Box 1135  
Chicago, Illinois 60690-1135  
(312) 807-4284  
Attorney for Applicants

Dated: October 27, 2004